



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

41  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/940,919	08/28/2001	Carl Johan Friddle	LEX-0228-USA	5149

24231 7590 11/17/2004

LEXICON GENETICS INCORPORATED  
8800 TECHNOLOGY FOREST PLACE  
THE WOODLANDS, TX 77381-1160

EXAMINER

WEGERT, SANDRA L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1647

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/940,919	FRIDDLE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Sandra Wegert	1647	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 August 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2 and 4-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 2 and 4-6 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)          |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. <u>11/10/04</u> .                                    |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.                                   |

Art Unit: 1647

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 2 and 4-7 are pending in this Office Action. Claims 1 and 3 were cancelled by the Applicant (2 August 2004 and 29 December 2003, respectively).

***Claim Rejections-35 USC § 112, first paragraph - enablement***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for an isolated or cultured cell comprising an SEQ ID NO: 1 and expression vectors, does not reasonably provide enablement for a host cell comprising an SEQ ID NO: 1 and an expression vector. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The examiner has interpreted the claims as reading on isolated host cells, as well as host cells in the context of a multicellular, transgenic organism and host cells intended for gene therapy. The specification of the instant application teaches that SEQ ID NO: 1 can be expressed in transgenic animals and any technique known in the art may be used to introduce an NHP transgene into animals to produce the founder lines of transgenic animals (Specification, page 17, for example). However, there are no methods or working examples disclosed in the instant application whereby a multicellular animal with the incorporated ("knocked-in") NHP gene of SEQ ID NO: 1 is demonstrated to express the NHP peptide. The unpredictability of the art is *very high* with regards to making transgenic animals. For example, Wang et al. (1999, Nuc. Acids Res. 27: 4609-4618; esp. pg 4617) surveyed gene expression in transgenic animals and found in each experimental animal with a single "knock-in" gene, multiple changes in genes and protein products, often many of which were unrelated to the original gene. Likewise, Kaufman et al (1999, Blood 94: 3178-3184) found transgene expression levels in their transfected animals varied from "full" (9 %) to "intermediate" to "none" due to factors such as "vector poisoning" and spontaneous structural rearrangements (pg 3180, col 1, 2<sup>nd</sup> full paragraph; pg 3182-3183). Additionally, for example, the specification discloses that two possible techniques used to introduce an NHP transgene into animals include pronuclear microinjection and gene targeting in embryonic stem cells. However, the literature teaches that the production of transgenic animals by microinjection of embryos suffers from a number of limitations, such as the extremely low frequency of integration events and the random integration of the transgene into the genome which may disrupt or interfere with critical endogenous gene expression (Wigley et al., 1994, Reprod Fert Dev 6: 585-588). The inclusion of sequences that allow for homologous

Art Unit: 1647

recombination between the transgenic vector and the host cell's genome does not overcome these problems, as homologous recombination events are even rarer than random events. Therefore, in view of the extremely low frequency of both targeted and non-targeted homologous recombination events in microinjected embryos, it would have required undue experimentation for the skilled artisan to have made any and all transgenic non-human animals according to the instant invention. Furthermore, regarding gene targeting in embryonic stem cells, the specification does not provide guidance for identifying and isolating embryonic stem cells or for identifying other embryonic cells which are capable of contributing to the germ line of any animal. At the time of filing, Campbell et al. teaches that, "in species other than the mouse the isolation of ES cells has proved more difficult. There are reports of ES-like cell lines in a number of species...However, as yet there are not reports of any cell lines which contribute to the germ line in any species other than mouse" (Campbell et al., 1997, *Theriology* 47(1): 63-72; see pg 65, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph). Thus, based on the art recognized unpredictability of isolating and using embryonic stem cells or other embryonic cells from animals other than mice to produce transgenic animals, and in view of the lack of guidance provided by the specification for identifying and isolating embryonic cells which can contribute to the germ line of any non-human mammal other than the mouse, such as dogs or cows, the skilled artisan would not have had a reasonable expectation of success in generating any and all non-human transgenic animals using ES cell technology.

The specification also discloses that "nucleotide constructs" encoding NHP products can be used to genetically engineer host cells to express such products in vivo and that these products can be used in gene therapy approaches for the modulation of NHP expression (pg 16, first

Art Unit: 1647

paragraph). However, the specification does not teach any methods or working examples that indicate an NHP nucleic acid was introduced into and expressed in a cell for therapeutic purposes. The disclosure in the specification is merely an invitation to the artisan to use the current invention as a starting point for further experimentation. For example, the specification does not teach what type of vector would introduce the NHP nucleic acid into the cell or in what quantity and duration. Relevant literature teaches that since 1990, about 3500 patients have been treated via gene therapy and although some evidence of gene transfer has been seen, it has generally been inadequate for a meaningful clinical response (Phillips, A., J, 2001, Pharm Pharmacology 53: 1169-1174, abstract). Additionally, the major challenge to gene therapy is to deliver DNA to the target tissues and to transport it to the cell nucleus to enable the required protein to be expressed (Phillips, A.; pg 1170, ¶ 1). The problems with gene therapy are generally seen as two-fold: 1) a system must be designed to deliver DNA to a specific target and to prevent degradation within the body, and 2) an expression system must be built into the DNA construct to allow the target cell to express the protein at therapeutic levels for the desired length of time (pg 1170, ¶ 1). Since the Specification does not teach gene therapy techniques that overcome these problems, undue experimentation would be required of the skilled artisan to introduce and express an NHP nucleic acid into the cells of an animal. Additionally, gene therapy is unpredictable and complex such that one skilled in the art may not necessarily be able to introduce and express an NHP nucleic acid in the cells of an animal or be able to produce an NHP protein in such a way.

Due to the large quantity of experimentation necessary to generate a transgenic animal expressing the NHP protein and to introduce and express an NHP nucleic acid in cells of an

Art Unit: 1647

animal for therapy, the lack of direction/guidance presented in the specification regarding how to introduce an NHP nucleic acid in the cells of an animal to be able produce that NHP, the absence of working examples directed to same, the complex nature of the invention, the state of the prior art which establishes the unpredictability of making transgenic animals and the unpredictability of transferring genes into an organism's cells, and the breadth of the claims which fail to recite any cell type limitations, undue experimentation would be required of the skilled artisan to make and/or use the claimed invention in its full scope. (Please note that this issue could be overcome by amending the claim to recite, for example, "An isolated host cell...").

**Conclusion:** Claim 7 is rejected for the reasons recited above.

Claims 2 and 4-6 are allowable.

#### **Advisory information**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sandra Wegert whose telephone number is (571) 272-0895. The examiner can normally be reached Monday - Friday from 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM (Eastern Time). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Brenda Brumback, can be reached at (571) 272-0961.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

Art Unit: 1647

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SLW

10 November 2004

*Elizabeth C. Kemmerer*

ELIZABETH KEMMERER  
PRIMARY EXAMINER